DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 795 HE 018 977

AUTHOR Ducote, Janice M.
TITLE Curriculum in Higher Education: Historical Influences and Curricular Models.
PUB DATE Nov 85
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at a Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Biloxi, MS, November 6-8, 1985).
PUB TYPE Historical Materials (060) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; Civil Rights; *College Curriculum; *College Instruction; Cultural Education; *Educational History; Educational Objectives; Enrollment Trends; Experiential Learning; Federal Legislation; Futures (of Society); Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; Individualized Instruction; Models; Specialization; Technological Advancement; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

Historical and societal conditions that have influenced the college curriculum are considered, along with issues of the 1980s. Up to the 19th century, the bachelor of arts degree was a preprofessional degree; the Ph.D. degree was introduced after the Civil War. Since the doctoral degree emphasized research skills, universities began to employ research-oriented faculty members, and departments gained control over the curriculum. With industrialization, there was increased demand for specialization, new scientific knowledge, and new occupations. Additional factors that influenced the curriculum included: the land grant college movement, the G.I. Bill, desegregation legislation, increased college enrollments during the 1960s, the civil rights movement, the Vietnam protest period, increased enrollment of nontraditional and foreign students, and legislation regarding the handicapped. Important issues in the 1980s include technological innovations, the growing trend to change careers, financial problems facing colleges, underprepared college students, and declining enrollments. Curriculum models that focus on the following are distinguished: subject matter, student experience, cultural heritage, objectives or outcomes, individualized study and student needs, and the future. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FD264795

Curriculum in Higher Education: Historical Influences and Curricular Models

Janice M. Ducote

Area of Behavioral Studies

College of Education

The University of Alabama

Paper presented at

Mid-South Educational Research Association

November 6-8, 1985

HE 018 977

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Janice M. Ducote

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Curriculum in Higher Education:
Historical Influences and Curricular Models

American higher education is facing numerous problems. Curriculum design is an issue of importance since each student is influenced by the curricular structure. The Latin origin of the word curriculum, means a course over which races were run (Griffin, 1983). Today curriculum implies a course of studies one pursues in an educational setting, but Steller (1983) expanded upon the definition demonstrating the evolution of curricular thinking. First, curriculum was a course of studies including grammar, literature, writing, mathematics, sciences, history, and foerign languages. Then, curriculum was thought to include all experiences students encounter under the guidance of teachers. Next, the idea that a student should plan his/her own curriculum emerged, and finally, the curriculum has become synonymous with a plan directed towards attaining educational goals.

The college curriculum should be reflective of the mission set forth by the educational institution. Brubacher (1982) lists three functions of higher education as the transmission of learning, expanding the limits of knowledge, and putting the results at the service of the public. In other words, the college or university mission is teaching, research, and service. The particular mission stressed by the university and reflected in the curriculum is dependent upon available financial support, tradition, the interests of faculty members, the size and location of facilities, and the natural and intellectual climates of the campus (Carnegie Foundation, 1977). Other factors which contribute to the development of curriculum in higher education include historical and social conditions altering society. Lawton (cited by Griffin, 1983) believes curriculum is a selection from the culture of society planned to transmit certain aspects of life, kinds of knowledge, attitudes, and values to the next generation. In planning a curriculum, decisions are made to select appropriate content. This selection is aimed at producing an educated person. A question frequently debated is what constitutes an educated person?

Many authors have discussed the characteristics of the educated person (e.g., Association of American Colleges, 1985; Cleveland, 1981; Josephs, 1981; Logan, 1983; and Scully, 1985). For years, educators have been trying to define specific content which will produce an educated

person since 1918 when the Seven Cardinal Principles were listed as the necessary components of a curriculum. These principles were health, fundamental processes, worthy home membership, vocation, civic education, worthy use of leisure time, and ethical character (Brandt & Tyler, 1983). A report from the National Endowment for the Humanities states that curriculum should be re-shaped according to a clear vision of the educated person regardless of the student's major (Lewis, 1985). This recommendation may serve as a stimulus for a return to the liberal or general education curriculum. However educators are still left with an imprecise definition of the educated person.

Logan (1983) presents a model of the educated person; according to this author, the educated person should be: (1) skilled for the world by having practical reasoning and career-related skills, (2) enriched by the world such that one's perspective and values are nurtured by culture, history, knowledge, and aesthetic appreciation, (3) engaged in the world in an effort to understand and solve the problems of society or humanity, and (4) detached from the world for reflection, conceptualization, and objective analysis. Indeed, the person possessing a majority of such skills would be educated. Curriculum is the medium through which a student is transformed into an educated person, assuming the content is selected properly (Heathcote, Kempa, & Roberts, 1982). An ideal curriculum should be responsive to both the conceptions of the educated person and to the institution's mission with consideration given to the student's needs and desires (Lamdin, 1982).

The Carnegie Foundation (1977) identifies the components of curriculum most frequently found in college settings. First, are the advanced learning skills which include English composition, a study of foreign languages, algebra, geometry, and physical education. Secondly, the general understanding component yields the common, basic undergraduate learning experiences. Breadth components introduce the student to the concerns of the subject fields. The major or concentration is a collection of subjects designed by a department. Electives are selected by the student.

English (1983) states curriculum designs are not generally related to a researched theory. Steller (1983) says the principles of curriculum have evolved primarily from practice rather than from logic. In reality, numerous social, political, and economic factors which are a part of American history have shaped and modified curriculum practices in higher education. These historical influences have exerted pressure on higher

education, forcing curriculum reform or the implementation of new ways to study. To understand where higher education is today, it is helpful to turn back the hands of time in order to glimpse societal conditions which brought about curriculum change.

Historical Influences

The first 200 years of higher education in this country were shaped by tradition. Up to the 19th century, the BA degree was a pre-professional degree (Rudolph, 1984). The early students were a few young men who sought to develop cultural attributes which signified superior status (Carnegie Foundation, 1977). At the same time, a liberal education was the proper preparation for entering teaching, medicine, law, or the clergy (Carnegie Foundation, 1977). Hardison (cited by Halliburton, 1977) notes that Greek and Latin were studied because all essential knowledge was thought to be contained in the classics. Latin was an international language, therefore it was required. Literature was part of the curriculum since it could be used to teach ethical values.

After the Civil War, the Ph. D. degree was introduced. Since this degree emphasizes research skills, universities began to employ research-oriented faculty members. Departments gained control over curriculum and started to specialize in particular disciplines (Association of American Colleges, 1985). The focus on research continues to grow in higher education, possibly because research activities are rewarded by tenure, promotions, and receiving external grants (Heller, 1985).

With industrialization of the country, there was an increased demand for specialization, for new knowledge gained from scientific study, and for new occupations. Students were drawn to colleges by the land grant movement (Carnegie Foundation, 1977). Young people looked to higher education as a way to enter the professions. Vocational education became mixed in with liberal arts. In 1944, the G.I. Bill was enacted by Congress, making it possible for war veterans to receive assistance in securing higher education (Bareikis, 1985). After World War II recruiters from industry were interested in the well-rounded college graduate as a future employee (Carnegie Foundation, 1977). Authority over the curriculum was shared by society and academicians (Association of American Colleges, 1985).

Other social changes dramatically altered the curriculum of higher education. In 1954, the Supreme Court ruled on segregation ordering the integration of minorities into white institutions. By the 1960's there was an increase in minority students and curriculum was altered to include Black Studies (Carnegie Foundation, 1977). From 1957 to 1960, the launching of Sputnik stimulated new trends in education including the need to prepare teachers more adequately, attempts to gain knwoledge for use, and producing new knowledge through scientific study (Carnegie Foundation, 1977). This race into space gave universities a research orientation even more than in the past, drew in federal grants, and served as a means of funding graduate assistants. Departments continued to become more specialized while the undergraduate curriculum moved from being broad-based to vocationally oriented (Hall & Kevles, 1982). Sjogren (1983) reports that admissions were very selective during this time period.

During the 1960's children of the post war baby boom era began to matriculate in increasing numbers. The supply of applicants was abundant, thus entrance requirements were increased. The American experience of overpopulation encouraged the pursuit of environmental studies. A concern for civil rights resulted in curriculum modification to include ethnic studies on a larger scale (Carnegie Foundation, 1977). The Vietnam protest period resulted in student demand for relevancy and gave birth to a period of consumer choice (Carnegie Foundation, 1977 and Hall & Kevles, 1982). Core requirements were dropped, the elective system was instituted, and students began to participate in curriculum decisions (Hall & Kevles, 1982).

The early 1970's brought new student groups to campus which diversified the student body. Minorities, older students, women, and students of low socioeconomic status enrolled in increasing numbers. International students also came to the United States to study in American colleges (Sjogren, 1983). Each of these groups had special needs which institutions tried to address by offering classes at unusual times, teaching English as a second language, assisting with child-care services, and developing work-study programs for financial aid. Decline of entrance test scores necessitated remedial courses and grade inflation became a new trend (Sjogren, 1983). Women's Studies were eventually offered (Carnegie Foundation, 1977).

From 1978 to 1981, faculty and the college began to relate to students as clients (Rudolph, 1984). No longer was the educational system able to act

as a parent or authority figure. Administrative and faculty personnel were suddenly confronted by demands for accountability, negotiation, a spirit of consumerism, and increasing litigation (Sjogren, 1983). The new relationship with the students focused attention on student rights and on legal concerns. For example, laws exist which require higher education to provide services to the handicapped. To assist the handicapped, buildings were renovated to include ramps and elevators; costly transportation programs, free tutors, and note-takers were made available. These extra-services are not only expensive, but cast doubt on the quality of one's degree (Snell & Rosberg, 1984). Another legal issue is that colleges must be careful about the wording in catalogs and cannot cancel a program of studies once students have enrolled. There is an assumption that the catalog constitutes a legally binding contract once students are enrolled (Carnegie Foundation, 1977). Novum College attempted to cancel a master's program in human ecology; students took legal action asking for damages and for the continuation of the program (Cunningham & Zirkel, 1984). Legalistic considerations alter both policy decisions and the ways in which higher education fills its mission.

The Present

The 1980's inherited problems from the past; new trends continue to emerge and confront educators with curriculum decisions. Recent innovations in technology have altered the American way of life, affecting such a wide-range of human activities including education, banking, operating cash registers, the storage of information, medical treatments, and the field of communications. Students will expect the college environment to be supported by high technology (Corey, Jaksen, & Pritchard, 1983). Of course, the computer is one tool associated with technologic development; somehow the campus must provide computer access. It has been suggested that students should buy their own microcomputers and software. While this would help solve higher education's problem of keeping up-to-date with computer support, it would increase the cost of obtaining an education and possibly prevent low income students from enrolling. If the curriculum is to include training in computer skills, either the institution will have to make computers available or help students purchase the equipment at a reduced cost. Further, innovations in technology have generated new careers in space, computers, weapons, and the energy fields (Harleston, 1983). People entering these

occupations will need specialized training, thus colleges may offer new majors where the curriculum is selected to build the necessary skills. Ashworth (1984) fears that an emphasis on specific job skills may turn colleges into trade schools. In contrast, Naisbitt (1982, cited by Corey, et al., 1983) views dynamic changes in society as leading us away from the specialist who soon becomes obsolete to a need for the generalist who is able to adjust to change. Liberal education has a goal of helping students to understand and to decide how to deal with new situations (Harleston, 1983). Thus, rapid technologic change may motivate an institution to include both career-oriented and liberal education within the curriculum design.

A growing trend of the American worker is that of changing careers during one's life-time. Walters and Saddlemire (1979) reported that the average person will change occupations 3 to 4 times during his/her life. In their discussion of the aging baby-boom population, Corey, et al.,(1983) noted that people may need to acquire mid-career re-training to adjust to new demands in the work place. Such a trend would argue against specific vocational training as part of the curriculum, however, the student must learn how to learn outside of the classroom as well as how to build on the knowledge he/she already possesses. A curriculum which emphasizes transferable skills seems well-suited as a means of addressing this career change trend.

The nature and acquisition of knowledge also influences the curriculum of higher education. Ball(1984) and cognitive psychologists view the acquisition of knowledge as a process of reorganizing the cognitive structure based upon the individual's interaction with the environment. Students try to make sense of their experiences much like the scientist tries to understand data collected through observation. Teachers can help students learn by assisting them to integrate incoming information with what the student already knows. In higher education knowledge tends to be disseminated via a series of component courses (Haberman, 1984). Most courses have required textbooks; books often determine the content of the curriculum. The Carnegie Foundation (1977) surveyed book publishers, reporting that one publisher said books are a product of what teachers say they need, what authors can write, and what a publisher can produce and sell. Surely books do not represent what teachers feel they need since there are other parties involved. Additionally books do not convey knowledge well because technologic advances and research findings make knowledge grow on a daily basis. For example, the electron microscope

enabled scientists to identify new cellular structures. The computer and its programs has made it possible for researchers to do more complex data analyses which often lead to very interesting findings. With such advances, knowldege is constantly expanding. Books used in the classroom become out-dated quickly and are abandoned for newer, more costly editions. Libraries must struggle to keep current information available for students and faculty use.

Knowledge is organized into subject areas (Heathcote, Kempa, & Roberts, 1982) and has been delivered to students through the medium of courses. Decisions made by curriculum developers will determine the specific courses required to complete a degree. Courses are taught in a variety of ways: two methods emerge as polar opposites. Receptive learning can occur when faculty members refer to a body of knowledge, state principles, or give examples. Knowledge can be acquired through discovery learning where students have experiences, they use knowledge, and discover new principles via an experientially-oriented activity (Heathcote, et al., 1982). A teacher's skills and personal attitudes will influence which approach is favored in the college classroom (Berquist, Gould, & Greenberg, 1981), however, both receptive and discovery learning can be mixed in the course. In the opinion of Birkhead (1984) students want learning which is relevant to earning a living as well as learning which is concrete and certain. Unfortunately, much of the knowledge in higher education is abstract and boarders between what is known and unknown (Brubacher, 1982). Many an undergraduate has difficulty accepting the uncertain aspects of the universe and will plead with the professor to share the "truth" about a topic or theory. Also, they will accept as fact whatever is printed in the textbook, having little ability to discriminate between an author's opinion and factual content. This is especially true of the lower classmen.

In addition to teaching, faculty members are expected to contribute to the advancement of knowledge. Finn (1984) accuses faculty of being lax in this duty and questions whether or not they are engaged in research. The recent report on excellence in undergraduate education by Mortimer, Astin, Blake, Bowen, Gamson, Hodgkinson, and Lee (1984) encourages faculty to become more involved in teaching while making assertions that graduate assistants are poorly trained to instruct undergraduates. In response, Newell (1984) states that faculty are already overworked by pressures to do research and to publish in addition to fulfilling teaching responsibilities. Newell asks,

"How can faculty be expected to do everything at once?" The Association of American Colleges (1985) believes there are faculty who are discontent with the research and publication demands; these people care about teaching. They wish to restore the curriculum with coherence and vitality. Colleges should re-design their promotion and reward systems to encourage the teaching-oriented faculty to step forward and to voice their ideas about curriculum.

Wharton, Chancellor at the University of New York, conducted a survey of university presidents who cited funding as the chief problem in modern higher education. The second major problem was the need to replace equipment (Kasouf, 1984a). Since the 1960's government's confidence in higher education as a worthwhile investment has been decreasing. In the past the government has contributed funds to higher education, however, the budget has been reduced. Budget constraints force curriculum revision, require the faculty to justify class size, decrease the willingness to try new curricular ideas, and raise the number of popular courses to increase enrollment (Carnegie Foundation, 1977). Inflation, decreases in worker productivity, and spiraling energy costs (Corey, et al., 1983) are factors which have contributed to the decline of financial support in higher education. The public is less willing to support higher education, thus financial aid to students will decrease. This situation places a greater burden on the student's family and on the state (Smith, 1984), especially for those students with limited financial resources. It is conceivable that tuition will increase resulting in smaller enrollments. Therefore, institutions will do anything to recruit and retain "warm, tuition paying bodies" (Finn, 1984) even to the point of lowering admission standards and graduation requirements.

There is growing recognition that incoming students are not prepared to undertake college studies (Association of American Colleges, 1985). High school students are graduating with literacy levels that are declining (Corey, et al., 1983). Further, the undergraduate is less sophisticated and more dependent upon the professors and teaching assistants (Carnegie Foundation, 1977) thus requiring more instructional time than graduate students. If the institution's graduates are to be quality products, it will be necessary to include remedial instruction in the curriculum. Yet, some authors do not see higher education as the place for remedial learning. Although Mackey (1984) recognizes the commitment of this country to serve people from diverse backgrounds, he states "Universities should not, to any significant degree,

be in the business of furnishing remedial education to admitted students." Mackey suggests that remedial instruction should be obtained in adult education programs sponsored by the public high schools. The Committee on Quality in Higher Education (1984) takes an opposing view, recommending that universities provide support services and openly discuss with the unprepared student the quality and quantity of expected work as well as indicating how much time will be required to prepare for college-level studies. With this information, the student can make his/her own decision concerning the pursuit of a degree. Provision of remedial work is costly and could be resisted by faculty members who are impatient with the unprepared student.

On the other end of the special needs continuum is the bright high school graduate. Kasouf (1984b) reports that only one of eight highly able high school students enrolls in higher education and only half of those complete degrees. This would suggest there is something unattractive about post-secondary education leading to withdrawal from college studies. What can be done to retain the academically talented student? Increasing involvement in the academic program often helps to decrease the attrition rate. Ways to increase student involvement include living in residence halls, participation in extra-curricular activities, enrollment in honor programs, ROTC involvement, part-time jobs on campus, and participation in research projects (Astin, 1984). The Mortimer report seconds these recommended actions and adds suggestions to place more emphasis on freshmen and sophmores, to increase contact between faculty and students, and to improve academic advising practices and/or other student services.

Many of the things higher education should do to revamp the curriculum are costly. In the face of limited resources everyone must work to see that resources are allocated to high priority needs. Steller (1983) recommends curriculum planning as an aid to resource allocation. In such planning, it will be necessary to ask unpopular questions like which programs should be eliminated and what level of support should be given to continued programs? (Conrad, 1984). Bareikis (1985) recommends radical surgery to eliminate marginal programs and unessential support services while reducing staff. This could mean laying off workers or shifting faculty to teach courses they do not like. Highly specialized programs are often duplicative and could block general education (Davison, 1984). This specialization does not encourage cooperation between departments (Heller, 1985). The administration may want to use curriculum as a means of controlling the budget (Jacobson, 1984). The

Association of American Colleges recommends that existing resources should be used to create work-study programs, career education, and internship experiences. While over 70% of the higher educational institutions offer experiential learning, these courses require coordination between the community and the college, a sharing of duties between students and field supervisors, new expertise from the faculty, and new administrative practices (Duley & Permaul, 1984). In the long run, such courses have the potential to improve higher education because students would be visible and provide the community with needed services. This may help to re-vitalize public support of higher education and motivate new funding or contributions. Corporations already give more and larger gifts to higher education than other organizations, but business people expect a return from the investment (Bowling, 1983). Working together to educate students seems to be in the mutual interest of both the learning institution and corporate organizations. A number of private interest groups such as the Kiwanis and Rotary Clubs sponsor scholarships. These could help students with college expenses. Promoting positive relations with these special groups could result in members recommending that the recipient attend the local university instead of going to another institution. This would keep talent in the home community.

With decreasing resources higher education must make wise decisions concerning their distribution and take steps to improve its public image. The curriculum planner should also become aware of over-looked resources like visiting faculty members, peer tutors, parents, and counseling personnel (Bergquist, et al., 1981).

What does the future hold in store for higher education and its curriculum? The baby-boom generation will continue to age, leaving a void in college where they once caused crowded classrooms. Enrollment is expected to decline 25 to 50 percent (Corey, et al., 1983) between 1980 and 1997. In order to weather the resulting financial storm, higher education will need to alter curriculum for diversity and in ways that are attractive to available students (Sjogren, 1983). The pool of applicants will include non-traditional students, more minority and handicapped students, and part-time students who will take longer to complete degrees (Mortimer report, 1984). Each group will seek something different from higher education; curriculum will need to become more individualized and diversified or else students will not attend the institution. The attitude of consumerism will continue to be an issue in every aspect of campus life including curriculum.

Declining enrollments, limited resources, and increased expenditures will necessitate marketing of the institution so it will survive the economic hard times (Sjogren, 1983). While the word "market" may send shivers up and down the spines of faculty memebers whose philosophy does not see this as an ethical practice, the marketing approach does have advantages. Marketing can (1) build public confidence in the institution, (2) produce faculty involvement and pride, (3) obtain factual data for planning and decision-making, (4) improve retention rates and recruitment techniques, and (5) establish ties with businesses to encourage workers to use tuition aid plans (Coery, et al., 1983). However, false advertising is morally wrong and should not be practiced by the representatives of higher education who are suppose to be of high moral character.

Retention of students is one goal of the marketing strategy. Kasouf (1984b) believes the high attrition rate of bright high school graduates is due to a failure to motivate or to keep the students interested. The greatest attrition rate occurs between the freshman and sophmore years (Gordon & Grites, 1984). One reason for attrition could be student dissatisfaction. Since students are coming to campus to receive an education, a good place to look for dissatisfaction is the instruction received. In a study of college classroom experiences, students were dissatisfied with evaluation and had negative responses when teachers were critical or gave put-downs. They were more satisfied when teachers showed interest in them, allowed self-expression, gave opportunities to apply knowledge, and positive feedback, and treated students respectfully (Menges & Kulieke, 1984).

Regarding instructional practices students indicated a desire for the following: logical sequencing of material, feedback on tests and homework, lively lectures, use of examples, useful homework assignments, encouragement to ask questions, assistance with course work, quality instruction, fair tests, and equity in the treatment of students (Finaly & Neumann, 1985). The desires seem quite reasonable, however, they are easier to list than to deliver in every single class. Nevertheless, faculty should set these student desires as goals and try to design instructional methods which are fair, of high quality, of value, and help to provide feedback.

Studying the characteristics of students is a way to identify programs which will appeal to the applicants. Attractive programs would assist in

retention efforts if it were possible to package the curriculum to address the needs of specific incoming students. For example, evening and part-time students value education which is convenient, easily accessible, and personally applicable (Belohlav, 1984). Week-end college, off-campus classes, field study, and internships might encourage more students to attend evening and part-time studies. The older, non-traditional student seeks to broaden a previous educational background (Smith, 1984) while the younger, more traditional student wants occupational skills or credentials for entry into a first job (Ehrmann, 1984). Bright students would have an interest in advanced placement or honors programs (Sjogren, 1983). A curriculum approach to satisfy both traditional and non-traditional educational needs might employ a philosophy of life-long education. This philosophy views knowledge as necessary to tackle adult problems in occupational, familial, civic, or the leisure realm (Griffin, 1983). There are several different kinds of curriculum designs in higher educational settings. Selecting one design or combining two or more together can be a way to organize the curriculum so that it is an attractive package to offer new students. The curriculum can act as a marketing technique.

Curriculum Models

Rothwell (1984) and Bergquist (1977) have discussed a number of different curriculum models or types of designs. Their ideas on each model will be summarized. Where it is possible, the present author will suggest which student group(s) will find each design attractive.

The subject-centered curriculum focuses on a set of subjects. Students progress through courses in a logical sequence. This is a common approach, but is probably most successful with a small number of students enrolled in similar courses. The university or college offering this curriculum must carefully plan when course subjects will be offered and have a reliable method of predicting enrollment per course.

Opportunity-centered curricula attempt to provide adequate learning opportunities to all students. Such a design has potential if a college has promised open access and further, can support the varied programs. Both remedial and honors programs could be a part of the opportunity curriculum plan.

The heritage-based curriculum is a survey of many subjects oriented towards the transmission of cultural knowledge. Integrative learning is the goal or aim of this model. A thematic-based design is similar. Thematic programs reflect specific themes such as Black Studies or the development of Third World Countries. Older students or those who are interested in a particular culture would appreciate these models most.

The objectives-centered curriculum, like the competency-based model, stresses educational outcomes. Of concern is what the learner can do following instruction. Such models are excellent for assessing the quality of education received by the individual student. Present day core curricula are related to this model if objectives or post-evaluation of learning occurs.

A student-based model is responsive to student needs and allows the student some control over the substance and process of instruction. This model would allow many choices and individualization of learning. Older and non-traditional students would find this approach attractive. A values-based curriculum is useful for self-exploration. It permits values re-affirmation, values expansion, and values clarification. People who are experiencing transitional phases of life such as adjustment following divorce, death of a spouse, retirement, or mid-life crisis may be well served by a values-based model. Universities operated by religious organizations would also incorporate values into their curriculum design.

Futures-based curricula prepare students for the conditions and problems of the future. Those interested in life-long learning or in social problems may find this design to be suitable. The experience-based curriculum is oriented to the learner's perceptions and reactions to an experience. This model would appeal to those who enjoy a discovery-learning approach.

Experiential learning allows the student to participate in activities such as field experiences, simulations, cooperative education, and growth groups. This curriculum can incorporate components of the other models described above and can be a part of the career-based curriculum. Career-based models provide for vocational skills, but also focus on liberal arts education. This last type of curriculum springs from the career-education framework whose aim is to increase student understanding of the self and of occupational/educational opportunities. After completing a career-based course of studies, students would exit college with basic academic skills, good work habits, and skills in obtaining and holding jobs (Hoyt, 1976).

Since Americans place a high priority on career preparation as a function of higher education (Carnegie Foundation, 1977), a career-based curriculum has the potential for being an effective recruitment and retention device. It has appeal for both the traditional and non-traditional student.

Summary Remarks

A brief discussion of educational missions outlined some concerns of educators in American universities. Historical and social factors which brought about curriculum revision were described; these factors also hint at the current problems which confront higher educational institutions. All those who are affiliated with colleges and universities should think about these very real problems as decisions on policy and curriculum are made. As directors of student learning, educational administrators and faculty have a duty to provide students with the best possible instruction for the educational dollar. By examining models of curriculum which could be selected and by considering the student population, faculty may be better equipped to plan a curriculum which does in fact provide a higher education.

References

Ashworth, K. (1984). The commission reports: Identifying their possible harm and moving to protect higher education. Change, 16(5), 6-7; 53.

Association of American Colleges (1985). Integrity in the college curriculum. Chronicle of Higher Education, 29(22), 12-16+.

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25(4), 297-308.

Ball, S. (1984). Goals of university curricula. College Student Journal, 18(2), 102-107.

Bareikis, R. P. (1985). Merchandising the American university. Educational Horizons, 63(2), 76-79.

Belohlav, J. (1984). Academic planning - Back to the basics. Higher Education, 13(4), 405-412.

Bergquist, W. (1977). Eight curriculum models: In G. H. Quehl and M. Gee (Eds.), Developing the college curriculum: A handbook for faculty and administrators. (pp. 87-109). Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges.

Bergquist, W. H., Gould, R. A., & Greenberg, E. M. (1981). Resources. Achieving optimal use of people, situations, and materials. In Designing undergraduate education. (pp. 75-100). Washington, DC: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Birkhead, D. (1984). Conspiring against the undergraduate. Liberal Education, 70(3), 199-201.

Bowling, J. C. (1983). Selling higher education: A corporate viewpoint. American Education, 19(6), 31-35.

Brandt, R. S. & Tyler, R. W. (1983). Goals and objectives. In F. W. English (Ed.), Fundamental curriculum decisions. (pp. 49-61). (Report No. ISBN-0-87120-117-8). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 225 948).

Brubacher, J. (1982). On the philosophy of higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1977). Missions of the college curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Cleveland, H. (1981). What is higher about higher education? In Creating an integrated curriculum. (pp. 1-4). Washington, DC: American Association Higher Education.

Committee on Quality in Higher Education (1984). Excellence in public higher education: A call for action. Comments and recommendations. Revised. Harrisburg, PA: Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Facilities. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 247 821).

Conrad, C. F.(1984). Enhancing program quality. Community College Review, 11(3), 15-21.

Corey, D., Jaksen, D., & Pritchard, B. (1983). What's on the hoizon? Trends impacting on higher education. Warren, Michigan: Macomb Community College Planning and Education Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 231 270).

Cunningham, J. & Zirkel, P. A. (1984). Rights amid retrenchment. Educational Record, 65(1), 57-59.

Davison, F. C. (1984). Higher education's contribution to solving America's crisis in education. American Education, 20, 27.

Duley, J. S. & Permaul, J. S. (1984). Participation in and benefits from experiential education. Educational Record, 65(3), 18-21.

Ehrmann, S. C. (1984). Technology could change the goals of a college education. Educational Technology, 24(9), 7-12.

English, F. W. (1983). Fundamental curriculum decisions. (Report No. ISBN-0-87120-117-8). Aleandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 225 948).

Finaly, E. & Neumann, Y. (1985). The measurement and meaning of student's satisfaction with instruction. Journal of Instructional Psychology, 12(1), 11-18.

Finn, C. E., Jr. (1984). Trying higher education: An eight count indictment. Change, 16(4), 28-33; 47-51.

Gordon, V. N. & Grites, T. J. (1984). The freshman seminar course: Helping students succeed. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25(4), 315-320.

Griffin, C. (1983). Curriculum theory in adult and lifelong education. London: Croom Helm.

Haberman, M. (1984). The origin of the university course. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(4), 52-54.

Hall, J.W. & Kevles, B. L. (1982). The social imperatives for curricular change in higher education. In In opposition to core curriculum: Alternative models for undergraduate education. (pp. 13-38). Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Halliburton, D. (1977). Perspectives on the curriculum. In G. H. Quehl & M. Gee (Eds.), Developing the college curriculum: A handbook for faculty and administrators. (pp. 37-50). Washington, DC: Council for the advancement of Small Colleges.

Harleston, B. W. (1983). Higher education for minorities: The challenge of the 1980's. The Journal of Negro Education, 52(2), 94-101.

Heathcote, G., Kempa, R., & Roberts, I. (1982). Curriculum styles and strategies: A review of styles and strategies of curriculum innovation in secondary (and higher) education and their relevance and applicability to further education. (Report No. ISBN-0-85522-116x). Middlesex, HA: Publications Despatch Centre, Department of Education and Science. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 232 018).

Heller, S. (1985). While professors applaud report on decline of bachelor's degree, they reject the blame. Chronicle of Higher Education, 30(1), 29-30.

Hoyt, K. (1976). Refining the career education concept. (Monograph on career education No. 017-080-01610-9). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Jacobson, R. L. (1984). Higher education researchers probe curricular change. Chronicle of Higher Education, 30(4), 12-13.

Josephs, M. J. (1981). Curricular integration: Mortar for the ivory tower. In Creating an integrated curriculum. (pp. 5-8). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Kasouf, D. (1984a). A for effort awarded to US institutions. Times Higher Educational Supplement, 630, 8.

Kasouf, D. (1984b). US report blames 'failure to motivate'. Times Higher Educational Supplement, 626, 8.

Lamdin, L. (1982). Curricular coherence and the individual student. In J. W. Hall & B. L. Kevles (Eds.), In opposition to core curriculum: Alternative models for undergraduate education. (pp. 69-83). Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Lewis, A. C. (1985). Turning the screws on higher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 66(5), 307-308.

Logan, R. D. (1983). Bridging the traditional and non-traditional: A model for higher education. Liberal Education, 69(3), 233-243.

Mackey, C. (1984). From higher education's viewpoint. American Education, 20, 24-26.

Menges, R. J. & Kulieke, M. J. (1984). Satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the college classroom. Journal of Higher Education, 13, 255-264.

Mortimer, K. P., Astin, A. W., Blake, J. H., Bowen, H. R., Gamson, Z. F., Hodgkinson, H. L., & Lee, B. (1984). Text of new report on excellence in undergraduate education. Chronicle of Higher Education, 29(9), 35-49.

Newell, J. (1984). A catalyst and a touchstone: Involvement in learning. Change, 16, 7-10.

Rothwell, W. J. (1984). Curriculum theory reconsidered: Strategic planning and organization training. Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 12(4), 327-336.

Rudolph, F. (1984). The power of professors. Change, 16(4), 12-17; 41.

Scully, M. G. (1985). Panel calls bachelor's degree meaningless, asks professors to take lead in restoration. Chronicle of Higher Education, 29, 1;13.

Sjogren, C. (1983). The changing college admissions scene. Education Digest, 49, 28-31.

Smith, H.L. (1984). Planning for the coming resurgence in higher education. Change, 16(6), 37-41.

Snell, J. C. & Rosberg, W. (1984). Handicapped students and community college education. Journal of Instructional Psychology, 11(2), 104-105.

Steller, H. W. (1983). Curriculum planning. In F. W. English (Ed.), Fundamental curriculum decisions. (pp. 77-98). (Report No. ISBN-0-87120- 117-8). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (ERIC document Reproduction Service No. ED 225 948).

Walters, L. & Saddlemire, G. (1979). Career planning of college freshman and their perceptions of career planning. Journal of College Student Personnel, 20, 224-230.